

# Contents

<b>Contents</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>1 Automatic Diversity for WebAssembly</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Global approach . . . . .	1
1.2 CROW: Code Randomization of WebAssembly bytecode . .	2
1.2.1 Exploration . . . . .	3
1.2.2 Constant inferring . . . . .	4
1.2.3 Removing latter optimizations for LLVM . . . . .	5
1.3 MEWE: Multi-variant Execution for WebAssembly . . . .	5
1.3.1 Multivariant generation . . . . .	5
1.3.2 The Mixer . . . . .	7
1.4 Accompanying Source Code . . . . .	8



# 01 AUTOMATIC DIVERSITY FOR WEBASSEMBLY

---

We aim to create artificial software diversity for WebAssembly, by providing tools to make the process easier and feasible for developers and researchers. According to our exhaustive literature review, no software provides artificial software diversification for WebAssembly. Therefore, we need to enunciate the engineering foundation to implement the strategies defined in ???. Our implementations are part of the contributions of this thesis. We provide two tools that complement this work: CROW and MEWE. First, the former tool generates WebAssembly program variants statically at compile time to provide randomization. The latter tool provides the tooling to generate MVE binaries for WebAssembly. In this chapter, we describe our technical contributions. In Section 1.1 we enunciate how the current state-of-the-art lead us to contribute with Software Diversification through LLVM. We follow by describing our two contributions and their main technical insights in Section 1.2 and Section 1.3. Besides, we describe a new transformation strategy as part of our contributions.

## ■ 1.1 Global approach

The work of Hilbig et al. [?] at 2021 influences our design decisions. According to their work, 70% of the WebAssembly binaries in the wild are created with LLVM-based compilers. Therefore, we provide artificial software diversity for WebAssembly through LLVM. Other solutions would have been to diversify at the source code level or the WebAssembly binary level. However, the former would limit the applicability of our work. We propose the latter for future works.

LLVM is a compound of three main components [?]. First, the frontend (compilers such as clang and rustc) converts the program source code to LLVM intermediate representation (LLVM IR). Second, optimization and transformation processes improve the LLVM IR. Third and final, the backend component is in charge of generating the target machine code. In Figure 1.1 we show how we use the LLVM pipeline in our contributions, which are highlighted as dashed squares.

The global workflow in Figure 1.1 starts by receiving the source code. Then the LLVM frontend transforms it into LLVM IR representation ①. We alter the LLVM pipeline that compiles source code to Wasm by introducing a diversifier component.

The diversifier generates LLVM IR variants from the output of the frontend ②. The LLVM IR variants are inputs for our customized Wasm backend. The




Figure 1.1: Generic workflow to create WebAssembly program variants.

diversifier and the custom Wasm LLVM backend compose CROW, which creates WebAssembly program variants out of a source code program ③. In addition, an orthogonal tool comes from the generation of LLVM IR variants at Step ②. MEWE [?], merges and creates multivariant binaries to provide MVE for WebAssembly ④.

## ■ 1.2 CROW: Code Randomization of WebAssembly bytecode

This section describes the red squared tooling in Figure 1.1 named, CROW [?]. CROW is a tool tailored to create semantically equivalent WebAssembly variants from an LLVM front-end output. Using a custom Wasm LLVM backend, it generates the Wasm binary variants.

In Figure 1.2, we describe the workflow of CROW to create program variants. The Diversifier in CROW is composed by two main processes, *exploration* and *combining*. The *exploration* process operates at the instruction level for each function in its input LLVM. For each instruction, CROW produces a collection of functionally equivalent code replacements. In the *combining* stage, CROW assembles the code replacements to generate different LLVM IR variants. CROW generates the LLVM IR variants by traversing the power set of all possible combinations of code replacements. Finally, the custom Wasm LLVM backend compiles the assembled LLVM IR variants into WebAssembly binaries. In the following, we describe our design decisions. All our implementation choices

## 1.2. CROW: CODE RANDOMIZATION OF WEBASSEMBLY BYTECODE

are based on one premise: *each design decision should increase the number of WebAssembly variants that CROW creates.*




Figure 1.2: CROW components following the diagram in Figure 1.1. CROW takes LLVM IR to generate functionally equivalent code replacements. Then, CROW assembles program variants by combining them.

### ■ 1.2.1 Exploration

The primary component of CROW’s exploration process is its code replacements generation strategy. The diversifier implemented in CROW is based on the superdiversifier of Jacob et al. [? ]. A superoptimizer focuses on *searching* for a new program that is faster or smaller than the original code while preserving its functionality. The concept of superoptimizing a program dates back to 1987, with the seminal work of Massalin [? ] which proposes an exhaustive exploration of the solution space. The search space is defined by choosing a subset of the machine’s instruction set and generating combinations of optimized programs, sorted by code size in ascending order. If any of these programs are found to perform the same function as the source program, the search halts. On the contrary, a superdiversifier keeps all intermediate search results despite their performance.

We use the superdiversifier idea of Jacob and colleagues to implement CROW because two main reasons. First, the code replacements generated by this technique outperform diversification strategies based on hand-written rules. Besides, this technique is fully automatic. Second, there is a battle-tested superoptimizer for LLVM, Souper [? ]. This latter makes feasible the construction of a generic LLVM superdiversifier.

We modify Souper to keep all possible solutions in their searching algorithm. Souper builds a Data Flow Graph for each LLVM integer-returning instruction. Then, for each Data Flow Graph, Souper exhaustively builds all possible expressions from a subset of the LLVM IR language. Each syntactically correct expression in the search space is semantically checked versus the original with a theorem

solver. Souper synthesizes the replacements in increasing size. Thus, the first found equivalent transformation the optimal replacement result of the searching. We keep more equivalent replacements during the searching by removing the halting criteria. Instead, we limit the searching for a replacement with timeout and the replacement’s size. Our customized Souper reports a new code replacement as soon as an equivalent transformation is found.

Notice that the searching space exponentially increases with the size of the LLVM IR language subset. Thus, we prevent Souper from synthesizing instructions with no correspondence in the WebAssembly backend. This decision reduces the searching space. For example, creating an expression having the `freeze` LLVM instructions will increase the searching space for instruction without a Wasm’s opcode in the end. Moreover, we disable the majority of the pruning strategies of Souper for the sake of more variants.

### ■ 1.2.2 Constant inferring

One code transformation strategy of Souper does *constant inferring*. This means that Souper infers pieces of code as a single constant assignment. In particular, Souper focuses on boolean-valued variables that are used to control branches. By extending Souper as a superdiversifier, we add this transformation strategy as a new mutation strategy to the ones defined in ??.

After a *constant inferring*, the generated program is considerably different from the original program, being suitable for diversification. Let us illustrate the case with an example. The Babbage problem code in Listing 1.1 is composed of a loop that stops when it discovers the smaller number that fits with the Babbage condition in Line 4.

Listing 1.1: Babbage problem.

```

1  int babbage() {
2      int current = 0,
3      square;
4      while ((square=current*current) % 1000000
5             ↪ != 269696) {
6          current++;
7      }
8      printf ("The number is %d\n", current);
9      return 0 ;
10 }
```

Listing 1.2: Constant inferring transformation over the original Babbage problem in Listing 1.1.

```

int babbage() {
    int current = 25264;
    printf ("The number is %d\n", current);
    return 0 ;
}
```

In theory, this value can also be inferred by unrolling the loop the correct number of times with the LLVM toolchain. However, standard LLVM tools cannot unroll the `while`-loop because the loop count is too large. The original Souper deals with this case, generating the program in Listing 1.2. It infers the value of `current` in Line 2 such that the Babbage condition is reached. Therefore, the condition in the loop will always be false. Then, the loop is dead code and is removed in the final

compilation. The new program in Listing 1.2 is remarkably smaller and faster than the original code. Therefore, it offers differences both statically and at runtime.<sup>1</sup>

### ■ 1.2.3 Removing latter optimizations for LLVM

During the implementation of CROW, we have the premise of removing all built-in optimizations in the LLVM backend that could reverse Wasm variants. Therefore, we modify the WebAssembly backend in addition to the extended Souper. We disable all optimizations in the WebAssembly backend that could reverse the superoptimizer transformations, such as constant folding and instructions normalization.

## ■ 1.3 MEWE: Multi-variant Execution for WebAssembly

This section describes MEWE [?]. MEWE synthesizes diversified function variants by using CROW. It then provides execution-path randomization in a Multivariant Execution (MVE). The tool generates application-level multivariant binaries without changing the operating system or WebAssembly runtime. MEWE creates an MVE by intermixing functions for which CROW generates variants, as step ② in Figure 1.1 shows. CROW generates each one of these variants with fine-grained diversification at the instruction level, applying the majority of the strategies discussed in ?? and *constant inferring*. MEWE adds a new mutation strategy. It inlines function variants when appropriate, resulting in call stack diversification at runtime.

In Figure 1.3 we zoom MEWE from the blue highlighted square in Figure 1.1. MEWE takes the LLVM IR variants generated by CROW’s diversifier. It then merges LLVM IR variants into a Wasm multivariant. In the figure, we highlight the two components of MEWE, *Multivariant Generation* and the *Mixer*. In the *Multivariant Generation* process, MEWE merges the LLVM IR variants created by CROW and creates an LLVM multivariant binary. The merging of the variants intermixes the calling of function variants, making possible the execution path randomization.

*The Mixer* augments the LLVM multivariant binary with a random generator. The random generator is needed to perform the execution-path randomization. Also, *The Mixer* fixes the entrypoint in the multivariant binary. Finally, MEWE generates a standalone multivariant WebAssembly binary using the same custom Wasm LLVM backend from CROW. Once generated, the generated multivariant WebAssembly binary can be deployed to any WebAssembly engine.

---

<sup>1</sup>Notice that for the sake of illustration, we show both codes in C language, this process inside CROW is performed directly in LLVM IR. Also, notice that the two programs in the example follow the definition of *functional equivalence* discussed in ??.




Figure 1.3: Overview of MEWE workflow. It takes as input an LLVM binary. It first generates a set of functionally equivalent variants for each function in the binary using CROW. Then, MEWE generates an LLVM multivariant binary composed of all the function variants. Finally, the Mixer includes the behavior in charge of selecting a variant when a function is invoked. Finally, the MEWE mixer composes the LLVM multivariant binary with a random number generation library and tampers the original application entrypoint. The final process produces a WebAssembly multivariant binary ready to be deployed.

### ■ 1.3.1 Multivariant generation

The key component of MEWE consists in combining the variants into a single binary. The goal is to support execution-path randomization at runtime. The core idea is introducing one dispatcher function per original function with variants. A dispatcher function is a synthetic function in charge of choosing a variant at random when the original function is called. With the introduction of the dispatcher function, MEWE turns the original call graph into a multivariant call graph, defined as follows.

**Definition 1.** *Multivariant Call Graph (MCG): A multivariant call graph is a call graph  $\langle N, E \rangle$  where the nodes in  $N$  represent all the functions in the binary and an edge  $(f_1, f_2) \in E$  represents a possible invocation of  $f_2$  by  $f_1$  [?], where the nodes are typed. The nodes in  $N$  have three possible types: a function present in the original program, a generated function variant, or a dispatcher function.*






Figure 1.4: Example of two static call graphs. At the top, the original call graph, at the bottom, the multivariant call graph, which includes nodes that represent function variants (in grey), dispatchers (in green), and original functions (in yellow).

In Figure 1.4, we show the original static call graph for an original program (top of the figure), as well as the multivariant call graph generated with MEWE (bottom of the figure). The grey nodes represent function variants, the green nodes function dispatchers, and the yellow nodes are the original functions. The directed edges represent the possible calls. The original program includes three functions. MEWE generates 43 variants for the first function, none for the second, and three for the third. MEWE introduces two dispatcher nodes for the first and third functions. Each dispatcher is connected to the corresponding function variants to invoke one variant randomly at runtime.

In Listing 1.3, we illustrate the LLVM construction for the function dispatcher corresponding to the right most green node of Figure 1.4. It first calls the random generator, which returns a value used to invoke a specific function variant. We implement the dispatchers with a switch-case structure to avoid indirect calls that can be susceptible to speculative execution-based attacks [?]. The choice of a switch-case also avoids having multiple function definitions with the same signature, which could increase the attack surface in case the function signature is vulnerable [?]. This also allows MEWE to inline function variants inside the dispatcher instead of defining them again. Here we trade security over performance since dispatcher functions that perform indirect calls, instead of a switch-case, could improve the performance of the dispatchers as indirect calls have constant time.

```

define internal i32 @foo(i32 %0) {
entry:
    %1 = call i32 @discriminate(i32 3)
    switch i32 %1, label %end [
        i32 0, label %case_43_
        i32 1, label %case_44_
    ]
case_43_:
    %2 = call i32 @foo_43_(%0)
    ret i32 %2
case_44_:
    %3 = <body of foo_44_ inlined>
    ret i32 %3
end:
    %4 = call i32 @foo_original(%0)
    ret i32 %4
}

```

---

Listing 1.3: Dispatcher function embedded in the multivariant binary of the original function in the rightmost green node in Figure 1.4.

### ■ 1.3.2 The Mixer

MEWE has four specific objectives: link the LLVM multivariant binary, inject a random generator, tamper the application’s entrypoint, and merge all these components into a multivariant WebAssembly binary. We use the Rustc compiler<sup>2</sup> to orchestrate the mixing. For the random generator, we rely on WASI’s specification [?] for the random behavior of the dispatchers. However, its exact implementation is dependent on the platform on which the binary is deployed. The Mixer creates a new entrypoint for the binary called *entrypoint tampering*. It wraps the dispatcher for the entrypoint variants as a new function for the final Wasm binary and is declared as the application entrypoint.

## ■ 1.4 Accompanying Source Code

This thesis is accompanied by the source code of both contributions, CROW and MEWE. The source code is accessible through the links:

1. CROW: <https://github.com/KTH/slumps>
2. MEWE: <https://github.com/Jacarte/MEWE>

Our software artifacts are licensed under the MIT License. The dependent source codes, such as LLVM, are licensed under their original licenses.

---

<sup>2</sup><https://doc.rust-lang.org/rustc/what-is-rustc.html>

## ■ Conclusions

This chapter discusses the technical details of the tools implemented for our main contributions. We describe how CROW generates program variants for the sake of software diversification. We propose a global architecture for a generic LLVM superdiversifier. We introduce a new mutation strategy that is a consequence of retargeting Souper as a superdiversifier. Besides, we dissect MEWE and how it creates an MVE system. In ?? we discuss the methodology we follow to evaluate how CROW and MEWE create software diversification.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- Narayan,S., Disselkoe,C., Moghimi,D., Cauligi,S., Johnson,E., Gang,Z., Vahldiek-Oberwagner,A., Sahita,R., Shacham,H., Tullsen,D., et al. (2021). Swivel: Hardening webassembly against spectre. In *USENIX Security Symposium*.
- Johnson,E., Thien,D., Alhessi,Y., Narayan,S., Brown,F., Lerner,S., McMullen,T., Savage,S., and Stefan,D. (2021). Sfi safety for native-compiled wasm. *NDSS. Internet Society*.
- Hilbig,A., Lehmann,D., and Pradel,M. (2021). An empirical study of real-world webassembly binaries: Security, languages, use cases. *Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*.
- Cabrera Arteaga,J., Laperdrix,P., Monperrus,M., and Baudry,B. (2021). Multi-Variant Execution at the Edge. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2108.08125.
- Cabrera Arteaga,J., Floros,O., Vera Perez,O., Baudry,B., and Monperrus,M. (2021). Crow: code diversification for webassembly. In *MADWeb, NDSS 2021*.
- (2021). Webassembly system interface.
- Sasnauskas,R., Chen,Y., Collingbourne,P., Ketema,J., Lup,G., Taneja,J., and Regehr,J. (2017). Souper: A Synthesizing Superoptimizer. *arXiv preprint 1711.04422*.
- Jacob,M., Jakubowski,M. H., Naldurg,P., Saw,C. W. N., and Venkatesan,R. (2008). The superdiversifier: Peephole individualization for software protection. In *International Workshop on Security*, pages 100–120. Springer.
- LLVM (2003). The LLVM Compiler Infrastructure .
- Henry,M. (1987). Superoptimizer: a look at the smallest program. *ACM SIGARCH Computer Architecture News*, 15(5):122–126.
- Ryder,B. G. (1979). Constructing the call graph of a program. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, (3):216–226.